

Tells the Facts and Names the Names CounterPunch

SEPTEMBER 16-30, 1998

Ken Silverstein & Alexander Cockburn

VOL. 5, NO. 16

■ IN THIS ISSUE

HOW TO FIND THIRD WORLD WAGES AT HOME

- Agribiz, Friends in Congress, Bring Back Bracero
- Senate's Jolly Green Giant Backs Bill that Fattens Bottom Line

ENRON DOES ENGLAND AND OREGON

- Gas Giant Buys Off Opposition at Home And Abroad

CHICKENS COME HOME

- The Collapse of Global Markets

OUR LITTLE SECRET

- Bill's "Core Values"
- Clinton and OJ: Beating The Man
- Scandal at Salon: Broder's Downfall

Ag Lobby in Big New Push

The Return of Bracero

With the help of two Democratic senators, the agricultural lobby is poised to resurrect a version of the infamous Bracero program, and allow American companies to import cheap immigrant labor. The legislation in question was attached to the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary appropriations bill, which has already been approved in the Senate by a vote of 68-31 (following a mere one hour of debate). The House will take up the legislation soon, with a vote expected by the end of October.

American agriculture has long made use of foreign labor. During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, thousands of Chinese and Filipinos were granted short-term permits to work the fields. The original Bracero program was approved during World War II, and allowed companies to make up for labor shortages caused by the war by hiring Mexican farm hands. Bracero was supposed to be a temporary measure, but Congress extended it in 1945. It was finally killed in 1963, by which time some 4.6 million Mexicans had moved through the program.

Big farmers have long dreamed of reviving Bracero, and they have a great deal of clout. During the past two years, the industry has funneled about \$1 million to members of Congress. The National Council of Agricultural Employers, a leading trade group, is spearheading the current drive on Bracero. The Council's federal lobbying budget for 1997 was more than \$200,000. That money has paid for a number of top lobbyists. More than \$60,000 went to four lobbyists at the firm of McGuinness and Williams—Tim Bartl, Jim Holt, William LaForge and Monte Lake. All learned the legislative secrets of agricultural policy from stints on Capital Hill or at the US Department of Agricul-

ture. Bartl was the former legislative director to Rep. Steve Gunderson, the conservative Republican from Wisconsin. Before joining McGuinness and Williams, LaForge spent seven years working for Sen. Thad Cochran, the Mississippi Republican, as legislative director and chief of staff. Before that LaForge served as the staff director for the Senate Appropriations Committee's subcommittee on agriculture, one of the most powerful staff positions on the Hill.

Another experienced Washington hand hired by the Council is Anthony Podesta, the brother of White House deputy chief of staff John Podesta. "The growers and their lobbyists have been working the Hill and district offices on this issue for more than two years", says Bruce Goldstein of the Farm Workers Justice Fund. "It's a nationwide campaign that has cost millions and millions of dollars."

Over the summer, the growers produced Democratic Senators Ron Wyden of Oregon, touted as one of Congress's most liberal members, and Bob Graham of Florida into drawing up such a plan. If passed, the measure — titled, in true 1984 spirit, the Agricultural Job Opportunity Benefits and Security Act — will greatly expand an existing "guest worker" program that now involves about 20,000 farm laborers.

Needless to say, Wyden and Graham have been well rewarded for their long years of service to the agricultural lobby. Between 1991 and 1996, Wyden pulled in \$54,400 from agribusiness firms - during this period, this arch-liberal friend of the working man took in five times more from business than he did from labor - while Graham received \$160,150.

("Bracero", continued on page 6)

Our Little Secret

TWO ORGASMS VS. KILLING TWO MILLION

The frolicking White House sex scandal is making fools of many, starting with Ken Starr and the House Republicans and continuing on through Democrats, pundits, parlor moralists of every description. Also included in this idiots' gallery are the Democratic "progressives" who often marshal their sentiments in such journals as *The Nation* and the *American Prospect*.

We speak here of folk like Bob Borosage, a mover and shaker in Washington's liberal public interest sector, whose life mission has been to persuade the world of the validity of the proposition that the Democratic Party not only has a "soul", but this same "soul" is progressive in nature.

Bob Borosage-type liberals now offer Clinton as a man who has destroyed the possibility of radical advance. If it wasn't for his sex-drive, they charge, the U.S. Congress would now be seeing a tremendous and possibly triumphant struggle for "a progressive agenda".

Editors
KEN SILVERSTEIN
ALEXANDER COCKBURN

Co-writer
JEFFREY ST. CLAIR

Design
DEBORAH THOMAS

Counselor
BEN SONNENBERG

Published twice monthly except
August, 22 issues a year:

\$40 individuals,
\$100 institutions,
\$25 student/low-income
CounterPunch.

All rights reserved.
CounterPunch welcomes all tips,
information and suggestions.

CounterPunch
P.O. Box 18675
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-986-3665 (phone)
202-986-0974 (fax)

This is only a slight twist on the myth they have been promoting for the past six years, to wit that there is a profound, radical impulse in the Democratic Party, even that Bill Clinton has been its secret leader, waiting only for the moment to spring into a telephone booth and emerge in the pink jumpsuit of radicalism. You would have thought that after six years of watching Bill Clinton and the Democratic Party doing exactly what the bankers told them, this analysis lacks credibility. But no. They are now bleating that Clinton must resign to prevent further damage to the radical impulse noted above. This is the line taken by Robert Kuttner, editor of the *American Prospect* and by David Corn, Washington correspondent for *The Nation*, whose high command has thus far admirably resisted such insane calls for Bill's resignation and taken a sensible attitude toward the whole scandal. Borosage now howls for Clinton's head.

So do *Nation* writers Marc Cooper, Micah Sifry and Doug Ireland. Now this trio has never argued for any political merit in Clinton. Doug in particular has written energetic political denunciations of the Lively Lad from Little Rock for as long as the Lively Lad has been in public view. But now they are taking the "radical impulse" nonsense seriously, to judge from their very odd statement in the *Nation* to the effect that Clinton has been "opportunistically eviscerating its [the Democratic Party's] core values and spreading the conservative world view of his corporate donors." In contrast to Bill's moral and political disgraces they offer, with a straight face, this vision of "a left" that, with Clinton driven from office, can somehow reconstitute itself inside and outside the Democratic Party.

How amazing that at the moment one sees in the American popular soul a swelling of emotion against puritan prosecutors, for privacy and sexual freedom, against hypocrisy and against the proddings and imprecations of the political and journalistic elites; at this same moment these liberal set their faces against these splendidly subversive popular sentiments because, they say, "this President is no longer...politically viable."

There's nothing more touching than progressives mounting the moral pulpit,

and Cooper, Sifry and Ireland don't disappoint us: "Integrity and honesty have always been the sine qua non of progressive politics, and they are fundamental to rebuilding an electorally meaningful left." The their vocal cords swell to bursting point; "We demanded public honesty and integrity from Lyndon Johnson and from Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan, and when they failed to deliver it we knew what to say. Bill Clinton should resign."

Golly, we've never been fans of Bill Clinton, but we will say one thing for him: Thus far - and he has a couple of years to go - he hasn't killed a couple of million people. LBJ and Nixon destroyed what was once called Indochina, and Ronald Reagan destroyed Central America. Bill had a couple of little adventures, in Somalia and Iraq, though carpers could call his refusal to designate the Rwandan massacres as genocide a bold stride towards Nixonian levels of responsibility for mass murder.

But really, only two halfway decent orgasms and a few fibs against Vietnam and Central America: It doesn't match up. And look at the words they use to evoke the ideals of the left: "integrity and honesty." In the old days we talked about class struggle and war against the money power. What a falling away, to the language of anniversary toasts at a Rotary banquet!

O.J. AGAIN?

As poll after poll has been showing, ordinary people have been registering their disgust at what Clinton has been forced to go through. All this is in marked contrast to the opinion-forming elites, sex skeletons crammed in their closets, who pace the ramparts of moral outrage on an hourly basis. Ordinary Americans feel it necessary to pay lip service to moral niceties, hence the low personal ratings they give to Bill. But the way they say what they really think is in the "job approval" ratings that jumped right after the release of the grand jury testimony, just as the Republican leaders' ratings dropped.

It's glorious to see Republicans like Hyde, who have spent their lives invoking the feelings of the "heartland," of "Joe Sixpack," now proclaiming virtuously that they give not a fig for polls and follow only the dictates of their own conscience—that same conscience which in Hyde's case issued no demur when he gazed upon the body of Cherie, a woman not his wife, and found it goodly and pleasing and well

worth getting to know more closely in the privacy of a motel room. (This was Hyde's self-confessed "youthful" indiscretion perpetrated at the age of 41. We're waiting for the day Strom Thurmond pleads guilty to a "youthful" indiscretion at the age of 82.)

Increasingly, we suspect, Americans are registering a larger disgust at prosecutorial techniques. There's a useful parallel to be made here with the last great legal spectacle, the O.J. Simpson trial. Many whites raged at widespread black support for Simpson, and tried to establish a false solidarity with the poor by denouncing "rich man's justice". It didn't wash with blacks, the overwhelming majority of whom had family members, friends or acquaintances mashed beneath the wheels of the justice system and rooted for O.J. on the grounds that with all his resources he at least might beat The Man.

Ditto with Clinton, with whom blacks in particular overwhelmingly sympathize in his present troubles. Here's the President, and he too is being put through the same old wringer. And so they're cheering for him, just as blacks cheered for O.J.

The unwonted release of the videotape, prompted by vehement Republicans, was an important event. For many years now defense lawyers have fought for release of grand jury testimony, and draw indictments on the basis of outrageous perversions of statements made behind closed doors. Clinton's and Lewinsky's testimony entirely ratifies such attacks on grand juries as currently used by prosecutors. Lewinsky, for example, emerged from Kenneth Starr's report to Congress as scheming and manipulative. On Starr's account, one could almost build a case against her as a shakedown artist.

From the transcript of the actual session in the grand jury room a very different and far more sympathetic picture of Lewinsky emerges, one that prompted many of the jurors to muster heartfelt expressions of sympathy and support.

A friend of ours who recently served on a grand jury said that the accused always did better if they showed up in person. In retrospect she found that the only accused whose cases the jurors threw out were those who came to testify. Their presence made the all-important human counterbalance to the alleged victim or cops. So it turned out with Clinton. There he was, flesh and blood (insofar as video can

be flesh and blood) and thus a human being facing the often bizarre innuendoes of Starr's Inquisition.

Clinton's always been a fake populist so it's a wonderful irony that he may owe his survival in office to populism expressed in the revolt of ordinary opinion against the hypocrisies and cruelties of the justice system and the posturings and hypocritical moralizings of the elites. How long can one watch a million-dollar-a-year network or in-house pundit with a divorce or two under their belts grandstanding about moral credentials? Not long.

Editors Silverstein and Cockburn's genial position on Bill's problems is not

We're waiting for the day when Strom Thurmond admits to a youthful indiscretion at the age of 82.

shared by our co-writer Jeffrey St Clair, who tends more to the Robespierrean posture, espousing the merits of both virtue and terror. Jeffrey believes that Clinton should be brought down by any means possible. We differ with our friend, yearning to see Bill impeached for almost everything but the sexual offense now being lodged against his name. The blue noses must never be encouraged.

BRODER'S FEET OF CLAY

Jonathan Broder has won admiring coverage for his criticism of Salon for publishing details of Rep. Henry Hyde's past cavortings. CounterPunch readers may rest assured that we most certainly would have made haste to bring such cavortings to their attention. Jonathan has clearly inherited the genes of his father David, a man so freighted with tedium that birds have been known to fall asleep when flying over his house. Not so long ago Broder Sr. compared Clinton unfavorably to Nixon, saying that at least Nixon committed his crimes in defense of the Presidency.

All the same, since CounterPunch strongly defends the right of columnists and reporters to criticize their editors, we support Jonathan Broder against his boss, David Talbot, who fired him for public insubordination. But Broder's no moral beacon amid the darkness of our age. A good friend of CounterPunch, in the form

of Andrew Cockburn, wrote a book about the Soviet military many years ago, called *The Threat*. It accurately predicted the collapses that were to come. Among the book's disclosures were details of a Soviet nuclear accident. While investigating this episode Andrew had occasion to need a researcher in Israel to interview immigrants from the Soviet Union who might have been familiar with the event. The NBC bureau in London recommended a stringer for the network in Jerusalem, J. Broder. Andrew called him, explained what the story was about and commissioned some legwork.

Not so long thereafter Andrew was mortified to see a story in the Chicago Tribune about the nuclear accident, precisely in the terms Andrew had described them to Broder, whose byline was appended to the Tribune's story, as that paper's stringer in Jerusalem. Andrew's feelings of strong dislike for Broder were pleasantly soothed in 1988 when Broder, by now the Chicago Tribune's bureau chief in Jerusalem, was dismissed when his editors noted an over-close relationship between the wording of his reports and those appearing somewhat earlier in the Jerusalem Post.

WHITEOUT: THE TOUR

CounterPunch readers can get St. Clair and Cockburn's *Whiteout*, the CIA, Drugs and the Press, for a nicely discounted \$18, shipping included. The book carries the strong credential of an attack in the New York Times by James Adams, a CIA-friendly hack who used to work for Rupert Murdoch, and an accusation in *The Nation* by JoAnn Kawell, that *Whiteout* is nasty ("ad hominem") about the CIA. Kawell is looking for foundation grants to ask what she calls the really hard question, why Americans take drugs. We have the answer. To get high, stupid. And why get high? All sorts of reasons, from Vietnam through the economy to the simple pleasures of an altered state. We have, on the other hand, been gratified by good press in a range from the San Diego Union-Tribune ("a solid piece of pitiless muckraking") to the Philadelphia Tribune ("an exceptional book").

St. Clair and Cockburn will be speaking in the northwest in the first half of October, at Powell's in Portland on October 7, at the University of Washington's book store in Seattle on October 13, and Elliot Bay Books in Seattle on October 15. ■

Power Dynamics

How Enron Gets What It Wants

In September Enron, the Houston-based energy conglomerate, sprawled across the front pages of the British press in a money scandal involving Tony Blair and his Labor Party. It seems Enron has been caught funnelling large sums of money to the Labor Party in an attempt to win government support for its planned \$2.2 billion takeover of Wessex Water, one of Britain's largest public utilities. The disclosures have blackened the eyes of Blair's party and prompted a government review of the merger and Enron's future business intentions in Britain.

Contrast this with the treatment of Enron in the US press. With the exception of CounterPunch, the American media have covered the energy giant as if it were the equivalent of a small electric coop in rural Vermont. But of course Enron's behavior in Britain is standard operating procedure for this company. When it can get what it wants by purchasing political favors, it will. On the rare occasion when that route fails, Enron doesn't hesitate to employ more muscular methods of persuasion.

It's been more than a year now since Enron swaggered into Oregon to gobble up Portland General Electric for a cool \$3.2 billion. The press delicately referred to the deal as a merger. But this has proven a wild misnomer. There's Enron is the dominant partner in this relationship. It's a company that never accepts a subservient role and doesn't tolerate anyone telling it how to behave.

Initially Wall Street mavens scratched their heads at the merger. What interest would Enron, a global energy giant, have in PGE, a moribund electric utility saddled with a defunct nuclear reactor? The answer came soon enough. Enron's sights weren't on Oregon, but its neighbor to the south, the 31 million residential electric consumers in California, and the high-tech, aerospace and defense factories that make the state one of the world's most power-hungry regions. This is the mother lode for the new energy robber barons. To enter this lucrative market Enron needed credibility as a power provider. But like a apex corporate predator Enron also had its eyes on PGE's assets, cheap hydro-power that it could sell across the West at huge mark ups, power plants and dams that it

could auction off, and a network of transmission lines that led right into the high-priced California market.

As for PGE's problem child, the Trojan reactor, Enron's acquisitions analysts believed it would prove only a minor irritant. There was a proven solution: stick the ratepayers with a large share of the costs of this misbegotten venture and dump the nuclear waste, and the attendant risk, on the federal government. This is the age-old strategy of privatizing the profits and socializing the costs.

Enron begrudgingly admits to all this in one of their latest filings with the Securities Exchange Commission, where

“Enron is trying to become the Salomon Brothers of the energy business.”

Enron's CEO Kenneth Lay confirmed that the acquisition of PGE “has allowed Enron to expand its West Coast power marketing operations and has assisted in establishing entry into retail markets in other parts of the country.” In other words, PGE customers are funding Enron's global expansion plans.

But the target is not just California. Enron truly has a global reach. In fact, more than 35 percent of the company's income derives from its international operations: pipelines across the Amazon, oil wells off the coast of Venezuela and Trinidad, power plants in Indonesia, China and India, and natural gas fields in Russia. The guaranteed profits from PGE can be channeled into any of these overseas operations, where Enron expects to make as much as 50 percent of its profits by the year 2002.

The purchase of PGE presents a microcosm for how Enron operates on a global scale. The first strategy is to lubricate the political system with generous infusions of campaign cash. Enron is one of the nation's top sponsors of both the Democratic and Republican parties, pouring over \$3 million into their coffers since 1989. This investment has yielded the company tremendous rewards, including government brokered and financed deals worth billions in China, Indonesia and In-

dia. In Oregon, Enron lavished contributions on the state's congressional delegation, supporting both Gordon Smith and Ron Wyden. Neither senator uttered a critical peep about the Texas takeover of Portland's electric utility.

The second tactic is to buy off the potential opposition, preferably as cheaply as possible. In Enron's power deals in India this took the form of political bribery. The PGE deal was a fairly straightforward operation. Enron pledged \$20 million to local charities and promised to contribute an addition \$10 million to Oregon environmental groups and conservation projects, effectively muting any uncomfortable questions about how the Texas company planned to deal with such home-grown issues as salmon conservation and low-cost electricity.

When philanthropic disbursements don't quell all the critics, Enron doesn't hesitate to reveal its dark side. The company has a well-earned reputation as one of the most aggressive companies in the energy business. “They play with steel elbows,” one bruised competitor said. In Oregon, Enron, and its partner in crime PGE, wasted no time in going after the Public Utilities Commission when the PUC had the temerity to question the public benefits of the merger. The energy conglomerate rushed to the Oregon legislature, promoting a bill that would eviscerate the PUC's regulatory power. Ultimately, the PUC buckled under the pressure and approved the deal.

And now the true price tag of Enron's takeover of PGE is being seen, as deals are cut to ensure that the lowest electric rates will go to largest and most wasteful consumers of power, pulp mills and aluminum plants. Meanwhile, some of PGE's most prized assets (its hydro-power plants) are being auctioned off to the highest bidder, with the ratepayers being expected to make up any losses.

A Wall Street analyst said that much of Enron's recent success can be attributed to the fact that natural opponents of the company don't understand how the firm operates. “People view Enron as just another natural gas outfit. In fact, they are a finance company. They're trying to set themselves up as the Salomon Brothers of the energy business.” ■

No Need for the Crystal Ball: Neoliberalism In Bloody Rout

So far as the world economy is concerned, the sky — as our dear friend Andrew Kopkind used to say, is dark with chickens coming to roost. As CounterPunch goes to press, capital is massing its resources in a determined effort to hold Brazil together and get Fernando Henrique Cardoso reinstalled as president, after which point he can impose enough austerity to suit the bankers' schedules.

And as the world economy cools, CounterPunch's predictions about the fragility of the boom are being resoundingly confirmed. The air is starting to seep out of the great speculative bubble, and with it subside the hedge funds like Longterm Capital Resources, the newly emerging markets and the hopes and dreams of those who had been arguing that the business cycle was dead.

In terms of the main indices of economic dynamism — the growth of output, of productivity and investment — the economy of the 1990s has been the worst of the postwar epoch, inferior even to the stagnant 1970s and 1980s, and not remotely comparable to the boom decades of the 1950s and 1960s. Robert Brenner of UCLA, who drew a stark picture of world economic "fundamentals in the July/August issue of New Left Review, "The Economics of Global Turbulence", points out that the growth of output per hour and also the growth of hourly wages has, since 1973, been worse than in any period during the last century, including the Great Depression and, on average, has not improved in the 1990s.

To put some numbers on the famous "fundamentals": Between 1950 and 1973, labor productivity growth in the private, non-farm sector was 2.7 per cent a year. From 1990 to 1996, it was 0.7 per cent. In 1997, workers' hourly wages were 12 per cent lower than in 1973 and exactly the same as in 1965.

To be sure, the jubilation of financiers, industrialists and their acolytes in the business press has not been entirely irrational. After a long period of depressed returns, corporate profitability, especially in manufacturing, did increase spectacularly in the 1990s. With the increased profits came the stock market boom, albeit at a tempo increasingly out of sync with reality. As always with bull markets, the children of Dr. Pangloss rushed out ex-

cited essays, arguing that we were now in a "New Age" or "Third Wave" economy, that there was no reason why the elevator should ever go down.

But the boom came at the expense of the working people and also of America's leading competitors. Between 1987 and 1997, real hourly wages here for production workers fell by more than 5 per cent and the US dollar was devalued by some 40-60 per cent against the Japanese yen and the German mark. Our goods thus became world beaters on international markets.

But this state of affairs, which provoked ecstasy on Wall Street and in the speeches of Team Clinton, full of self-congratulation about "growing the economy", could not last long. The economies of Germany and Japan went into crisis be-

"We've now reached a moment in which there is no good news anywhere in the world."

cause of the sag in exports consequent upon US competition. The US dollar duly began to rise, thus shaving down the American advantage. And as the US economy began to grow rapidly in the one glorious year of 1997, US wages at last began to rise.

By the middle of 1998, a snapshot of the fundamentals showed the predictable consequence. With their competitiveness now falling as a result of rising wages and also the rising dollar, US producers' profit rates began to go down. The stock market did not take long to reflect this changed situation.

Ironically, the very success of the United States in imposing its neo-liberal model on the rest of the world has played no small role in inducing the current downward lurch in economies round the globe. Neoliberalism spells out as slashed social spending, balanced budgets, tight credit. So, country after country lashed into austerity by the International Monetary Fund and other US-dominated institutions, have seen their own internal markets shrivel in consequence. Their only option has there-

fore been to export or die, and so they have, flooding the oversupplied world markets and forcing down prices. The crises in Asia and Russia have been the direct result of this international overcapacity in manufacturing and oil.

And so, homeward fly the chickens. The desperate export drives put pressure on US manufacturers' prices and profits. And the Russian collapse slashed into the profits of big US banks. Collapses in Latin America cast another dark shadow. With the stock market in tumult, consumers here will ease up on their gallant spending, which has been propelling the economy forward.

"We've now reached a moment in which there is no good news on the agenda anywhere in the world", Brenner says. Chipmunk chatter about the "fundamentals" no longer suffices. The received wisdom was wrong. Look at one more figure. Between 1989 and 1995, US government spending increased in real terms by only 0.1 per cent. Clinton should get that number up off the floor, and realize that ex-bond traders like Robert Rubin have a very limited notion of what "fundamentals" can mean to ordinary people, who don't see the Nineties in quite the terms as have he and his Wall Street friends. ■

SUBSCRIPTION INFO

Enter/Renew Subscription here:

One year individual, \$40

One year institution, \$100

One year student/low income, \$25

Please send back issue(s)

_____ (\$3/issue)

"I am enclosing a separate sheet for gift subscriptions"

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

Payment must accompany order.

Add \$10 for foreign subscriptions.

Make checks payable to: **CounterPunch.**

Return to: **CounterPunch.**

PO Box 18675

Washington, DC 20036

(Bracero, continued from page 1)

Along with the agribusiness lobby, Wyden and Graham argue that their proposal is urgently needed because of labor shortages facing U.S. farmers. Furthermore, supporters of the plan say, U.S. workers simply won't perform hard labor, a fact which forces growers to employ illegal workers. "The current agricultural labor system, for workers and growers, is a mess", Wyden said when he introduced the bill last July 21. "It leaves too many workers in shoddy working conditions, and too many farmers on the brink of bankruptcy."

Wyden was flanked that day by Oregon's other senator, right-winger Gordon Smith. Smith also supports the bill, saying that while he is deeply concerned about protecting farm workers, "Let's not forget that growers have been victimized by this process too". One thing that Smith omitted was that the issue of migrant labor is one in which he has a profound personal interest. Oregon's junior senator is the multimillionaire owner of Smith Frozen Foods, a company based in the eastern part of his home state. For decades, Smith Frozen Foods has been a major employer of migrant help.

None of the arguments advanced by the bill's supporters can withstand even casual scrutiny. As Bill Maxwell pointed out in an article for the New America News Service - which along with Legal Times is one of the few publications to cover the story - "Americans do all sorts of tough, dirty seasonal work, laying as-

phalt on highways, mining coal, roofing in 100-plus-degree weather, constructing buildings. The difference is that these jobs pay much better and usually offer benefits that everyone other than farm workers takes for granted."

Furthermore, the Government Accounting Office concluded in a December 1997 report that "A widespread farm labor shortage does not appear to exist now and is unlikely in the near future". The GAO concluded that legislation such as the Wyden-Graham bill would result in the firing of tens of thousands of American workers as growers replace

"A widespread farm labor shortage does not appear to exist now and is unlikely in the near future".

them with cheaper workers from abroad.

Instead of paying decent wages, the growers would prefer to cut costs by employing easily exploitable Third World workers. And keep in mind here that wages for U.S. farm workers have been falling steadily for more than a decade, with per capita pay currently amounting to a meager \$6,300 per year.

The bill would further squeeze farm hands and weaken the modest protections written into the current guest worker program. Indeed, Goldstein says the bill is even worse than the original Bracero law. Its chief provisions would:

- kill a law that requires growers to provide housing and transportation to farmhands - as was required under Bracero. Instead, workers would be given

a housing stipend and left to find their own quarters. That won't be easy, since the stipend is piddling - for example, \$125 a month in Wyden's home state of Oregon.

- waive the minimum wage requirement for individual workers. Companies will be able to pay workers as a group, and the group must receive, on average, the minimum wage. In practice, that means that companies will almost certainly pay sub-minimum wage to some employees. Yet another loophole will allow growers to, in some cases, avoid paying unemployment insurance.

- revoke a law that forces employers to pay workers for at least 75 percent of the contract time for which he or she is hired. Since farm work is unpredictable, this means that some workers may travel from thousands of miles away and find themselves unemployed and penniless.

- end a requirement that growers actively recruit in the US before seeking to hire foreign workers.

While Wyden and other bill sponsors declare that they are deeply, deeply concerned about farm workers, the chief effect of the bill will be to allow American companies to hire cheap foreign labor without the need to relocate abroad. In an interview with Maxwell, a Georgia onion grower made this point absolutely clear: "If we had a bunch of American workers, we'd have to hire someone like a personnel director to deal with the problems. The people we have now, they come to work. They don't have kids to pick up from school or take to the doctor. They don't have child support issues. They don't ask to leave early for this and that. They don't call in sick. If you say to them, 'Today we need to work for 10 hours,' they don't say anything." ■

CounterPunch
P.O. Box 18675
Washington, DC 20036

Presorted
 First Class Mail
 U.S. Postage
 PAID
 Permit No. 269
 Skokie, IL

First Class Mail

Journalism for grown ups